

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Corisis et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0189257).

Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corisis et al.*

Claim 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Corisis et al.* in view of *Miyagawa* (U.S. Patent No. 6,780,023).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have amended each of independent claims 1, 2 and 12 that are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e). Accordingly, claims 1-3, 5-7 and 12 remain pending in this application for further consideration with claims 9-11 being withdrawn from consideration.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 12 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by *Corisis et al.* Claim 4 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Corisis et al.* Claim 8 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over *Corisis et al.* in view of *Miyagawa*. To the extent that the rejections might be applied against the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed

as being based on a reference or a combination of references that neither teaches nor suggests the novel combination of features recited in the claims.

With respect to each of independent claims 1, 2 and 12, Applicants respectfully submit that *Corisis et al.* does not teach or suggest a claimed combination including at least a recited feature of “the edge-bonding metal patterns being extended in a wafer level towards the edge regions of the center-bonding type semiconductor chip.” The recited feature is fully supported at least by Figs. 4a to 4c and their corresponding description in the specification.

The Final Office Action insists that *Corisis et al.* anticipates the present invention. Applicants respectfully disagree that *Corisis et al.* teaches or suggests each and every feature of independent claims 1, 2 and 12, as newly-amended.

Specifically, the Final Office Action appears to suggest conductive traces 45 of *Corisis et al.* as the claimed “edge-bonding metal patterns.” However, in contrast to the present invention of newly-amended independent claims 1, 2 and 12, *Corisis et al.* merely teaches a plurality of the conductive traces 45 are arranged in parallel between conductive vias 44 and contact pads 47. *Corisis et al.* is completely silent regarding whether the conductive traces 45 are extended in a wafer level.

Moreover, the Office Action appears to allege that *Corisis et al.* teaches the bonding metal patterns 45 connected with the bonding pads 34 through metal. Applicants respectfully disagree. In fact, *Corisis et al.* merely discloses that each of the conductive trace 45 extends from a corresponding electrically conductive via 44 including metal etc., and a rerouting element 40 including the conductive vias 44 and the conductive traces 45 etc. is positioned over the bond

pads 34. Applicants respectfully submit that *Corisis et al.* fails to teach that the bonding metal patterns 45 are connected with the bonding pads 34 through metal. Further, as disclosed in [0047] of *Corisis et al.*, “Rerouting element 40 may be secured to active surface 32 by way of adhesive material 48.” Such a disclosure of *Corisis et al.* teaches or suggests that the bonding metal patterns 45 are not connected with the bonding pads 34 but simply positioned over the bonding pads 34 without contact. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action’s allegations are improper.

As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that *Corisis et al.* fails to teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least the feature that “the edge-bonding metal patterns being extended in a wafer level towards the edge regions of the center-bonding type semiconductor chip,” as recited by each of newly-amended independent claims 1, 2 and 12.

In addition, the Office Action does not rely on *Miyagawa* to remedy any aspect of the above-noted deficiencies of *Corisis et al.* Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that *Miyagawa* cannot remedy the deficiencies of *Corisis et al.* That is, *Corisis et al.* and *Miyagawa*, whether taken individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest the claimed combination including at least the above-described feature recited in each of newly-amended independent claims 1, 2 and 12.

Accordingly, for at least the forgoing reasons, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection of independent claims 1, 2 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because the applied reference does not teach or suggest each and every feature of independent claims 1, 2 and 12, as newly-amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, “[t]o anticipate a claim,

the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that dependent claims 3-8 are allowable at least because of their dependencies from independent claim 2 and the reasons set forth above.

With no other rejections pending, Applicants respectfully assert that claims 1-8 and 12 are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

Except for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required,

including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account

No. 50-0310.

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: May 17, 2006

By: 

Xiaobin You

Reg. No. L0112

Customer No. 009629

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20004

Tel: 202.739.3000